

Spin tunneling in the Kagomé antiferromagnet

Jan von Delft and Christopher L. Henley

Laboratory of Atomic and Solid State Physics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 14853

(Received)

The collective tunneling of a small cluster of spins between two degenerate ground state configurations of the Kagomé-lattice quantum Heisenberg antiferromagnet is studied. The cluster consists of the six spins on a hexagon of the lattice. The resulting tunnel splitting energy Δ is calculated in detail, including the prefactor to the exponential $\exp(-\mathcal{S}_o/\hbar)$. This is done by setting up a coherent spin state path integral in imaginary time and evaluating it by the method of steepest descent. The hexagon tunneling problem is mapped onto a much simpler tunneling problem, involving only one collective degree of freedom, which can be treated by known methods. It is found that for half-odd-integer spins, the tunneling amplitude and the tunnel splitting energy are exactly zero, because of destructive interference between symmetry-related (+)-instanton and (−)-instanton tunneling paths. This destructive interference is shown to occur also for certain larger loops of spins on the Kagomé lattice. For small, integer spins, our results suggest that tunneling strongly competes with in-plane order-from-disorder selection effects; it constitutes a disordering mechanism that might drive the system into a partially disordered ground state, related to a spin nematic.

PACS numbers: 75.30.-m, 75.50.Ee, 75.10.Jm, 73.40.Gk

I. INTRODUCTION

Consider a Heisenberg antiferromagnet (AFM) with non-random but competing exchange interactions. The classical ground state is often non-trivially non-unique, in having a continuous manifold of inequivalent (but degenerate) ground states. However, if one takes account of quantum and thermal fluctuations around the classical ground states, the non-trivial degeneracy may be broken. The effects of fluctuations can generally be represented by an effective “selection” Hamiltonian, which is a function of the classical spin directions and “selects” certain ground states (sometimes having long-range order) in favor of others. Since long-range order can thus be induced out of an apparently disordered manifold of ground states, such selection effects are called “ordering due to disorder” [?].

An effect that *competes* with “order from disorder” selection effects is tunneling between different ground state configurations. Tunneling tends to drive the system into a superposition of degenerate states, rather than selecting a particular one. Hence, in the regions of parameter space in which tunneling events are important, they could suppress “order from disorder” selection effects.

In this paper we study spin tunneling in a 2D quantum Heisenberg antiferromagnet on a Kagomé lattice [?,?,?]. This is a frustrated spin system with a very large ground state degeneracy, in which various selection effects have been investigated [?,?,?,?]. We study tunneling events that involve the rigid simultaneous rotation of small groups of spins (“weathervane modes”, defined in section ??, in particular a mode involving only the six spins on a Kagomé hexagon). We find, rather unexpectedly, that the tunneling amplitudes are zero when the spin s is half-odd-integer, but non-zero when s is integer. This is due to destructive interference between two topologically distinct tunneling paths connecting the same initial and final states. The interference occurs when the tunneling amplitudes have different topological phase factors [?]. Therefore there should be interesting integer vs. half-odd-integer s effects for that range of s -values for which tunneling effects are as strong or stronger than selection effects: systems with integer s would have a greater tendency to be disordered because tunneling suppresses selection effects, whereas systems with half-odd-integer s , where tunneling is absent, would tend to be ordered.

Apart from studying the role of tunneling in the Kagomé lattice, we hope that this paper will provide an instructive example of a rather non-trivial spin-tunneling calculation. As is customary, the tunneling amplitude of interest is calculated by setting up a coherent-spin-state path integral in imaginary time and evaluating it by the method of steepest descent [?], which is an expansion in powers of $1/s$. Our calculation includes a complete evaluation of the prefactor to the exponential $e^{-\mathcal{S}_o/\hbar}$ ($\mathcal{S}_o$ is the classical action), and a discussion of the integration ranges of the spin path integral (these ranges are finite originally, but need to be extended to infinity to allow an evaluation of the prefactor). Although the calculation of tunneling rates for spin systems has been of interest in various different contexts [?,?,?,?], we are aware of only one recent paper where such prefactors are calculated explicitly [?]. Moreover, we show explicitly how one may give an exact treatment of the simultaneous collective motion of all the relevant spin degrees of freedom, by reducing the problem to one involving only a single, collective degree of freedom. The reduced problem can be treated by methods well-known from studying a particle in a double-well potential.

The results of our calculations suggest that for small, integer s , the tunneling amplitude

is sufficiently large that tunneling can be regarded as a significant disordering mechanism, that tends to drive the system into a partially disordered state, related to a spin-nematic state [?,?].

This paper is organized as follows: In section ?? we review ground state selection effects on the Kagomé lattice, and describe the hexagon tunneling event that is to be studied in later sections. In sections ?? and ?? we study a simple model Lagrangian, chosen such that it will be of use for the subsequent study of the Kagomé system. Specifically, the calculations of the classical action $\mathcal{S}_o$ (section ??) and the tunnel splitting energy Δ (section ??) are presented in detail. Section ?? shows how the full hexagon tunneling problem can be mapped onto the simple model problem studied in earlier sections, and contains the main result of this paper, eq. (??). In section ?? the occurrence of destructive interference during the tunneling of larger sets of spins on the Kagomé lattice is discussed. There are four appendices. In appendix ?? an estimate is made of the size and shape of the coplanarity potential that we employ in section ?? to study the hexagon tunneling problem. Appendix ?? contains a summary of results that are well-known for a particle tunneling in a double well and are needed in section ??.

II. THE KAGOMÉ ANTIFERROMAGNET

The Kagomé lattice is a 2D triangular lattice with lattice constant a_o , where sites have been removed at all sites of a triangular superlattice, with lattice constant $2a_o$ (see fig. ??). The quantum Heisenberg AFM on this lattice has the Hamilton operator

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}} = J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_i \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_j, \quad (J > 0) \quad (2.1)$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_i$ is the spin vector operator for the i -th spin and the sum runs over all nearest neighbors. Coherent spin states (see, e.g. [?]) may be used to discuss this system in classical terms. Associate the coherent spin state $|\varphi_i, \theta_i\rangle$ with the i -th spin, where the spherical coordinates $(\varphi_i, \theta_i) \equiv \Omega_i$ define a unit vector $\mathbf{n}_i$ (fig. ??a). The well-known property $\langle \phi_i, \theta_i | \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_i | \phi_i, \theta_i \rangle = s \mathbf{n}_i$, allows one to interpret $\mathbf{n}_i$ as a “classical spin vector”. Also, a “classical” Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ may be introduced as the coherent-spin-state expectation value $\langle \widehat{\mathcal{H}} \rangle$:

$$\mathcal{H} \equiv \left(\prod_{i \otimes} \langle \phi_i, \theta_i | \right) \widehat{\mathcal{H}} \left(\prod_{i \otimes} | \phi_i, \theta_i \rangle \right) = s^2 J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \mathbf{n}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}_j, \quad (J > 0) \quad (2.2)$$

When referring to the “energy” of a state, we shall always mean this expectation value $\mathcal{H}$. Likewise, the term “ground state” will not be used to refer to an actual eigenstate of the operator $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$, but to a state that minimizes $\mathcal{H}$. It is this $\mathcal{H}$ that is used in discussions of the classical Kagomé antiferromagnet.

The energy is minimized by any configuration in which the total spin on *each* elementary triangle of the lattice is zero [?,?]. In such states, the spins of any given triangle of the Kagomé lattice lie in one plane, with relative angles of 120° (see fig. ??b), forming a rigid unit in spin space. Because of the many ways of fitting such triangles together, the distinct classical ground states form a manifold with a dimensionality proportional to the system size.

A. Selection effects

It is convenient to describe the classical ground states with reference to a coplanar ground state, in which all spins lie in the same “reference plane”. All the coplanar ground states are constructed by labelling the sites by letters A,B and C, such that each triangle has one of each, and then replacing the three kinds of letters by spins in three directions differing by 120° angles [?] (fig. ??b); these states correspond one-to-one to the ground states of a 3-state Potts AFM on a Kagomé lattice.

All non-coplanar classical states can be generated by continuous distortions of coplanar states, henceforth to be called “Potts states”, without crossing energy barriers [?]. For example, any hexagon of six spins that is labelled only by two letters (e.g. ABABAB in fig. ??) can be rotated as a rigid unit in spin space by an angle φ around the C-direction without any cost in classical energy; this has been called the “weathervane” mode by Ritchey *et. al.* [?]. However, by expanding in spin waves about any given ground state, it has been shown that all non-coplanar states have a larger zero-point energy than the coplanar Potts states. This selection effect can be characterized by a parameter $J_b \sim O(sJ)$, and ensures that the true ground state will be coplanar [?,?,?,?].

Further study, using a self-consistent approach, yields a smaller “in-plane” selection energy, of order $J_c \sim O(s^{\frac{2}{3}}J)$, which favors among all possible Potts states a particular state with long-range order, the so-called $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ ground state [?,?,?], depicted in fig. ??. In this state, *every* hexagon is labelled by just two letters, e.g. BCBCBC. To encode the most important effects of this “in-plane” selection, it is convenient to define a “chirality” variable centered on each triangle, equal to -1 or $+1$ depending on whether the sites take values ABC in the clockwise or counterclockwise sense. In the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ Potts state, the chiralities on neighboring elementary triangles are antiferromagnetically ordered. Hence the selection energy can be expressed as an effective antiferromagnetic coupling, of strength J_c , say, between the chiralities.

B. Competition between selection effects and tunneling

The above considerations neglected the possibilities of large-scale fluctuations and tunneling between classical ground states. Clearly the smallest object which can tunnel is the “weathervane mode”: Consider as initial state, $|i\rangle$, the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ Potts state. If the six spins on an ABABAB-hexagon rotate by 180° around the C-direction (take the latter to define the z -axis), another Potts state, $|f\rangle$, with a BABABA-hexagon is reached (fig. ??). In the absence of in-plane selection ($J_c = 0$), $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ would be degenerate. Tunneling between $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ would tend to drive the system into a superposition $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|i\rangle \pm |f\rangle)$, with energy $E_o \pm \Delta$ (where Δ is proportional to the tunneling amplitude). Now, in the presence of in-plane selection effects, the energies of $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ differ by $12J_c$, since the chiralities on all six triangles bordering the hexagon of $|i\rangle$ are opposite to those of $|f\rangle$. If $12J_c > \Delta$, the tunneling amplitude is very small, and the system selects $|i\rangle$, the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ state. If, on the other hand, $12J_c < \Delta$ and the tunneling amplitude is appreciable, the system can lower its energy by adopting the superposition $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|i\rangle - |f\rangle)$.

Such a hexagon tunneling event can clearly take place starting from any Potts state $|i\rangle$ that contains an ABABAB-type hexagon, not just from the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ state. Thus, tunneling

constitutes a disordering factor that competes with in-plane selection. If such hexagon tunneling events occur with large probability throughout the Kagomé lattice, a ground state will result that is at most partially ordered (related to a spin nematic) (see section ??).

C. Effective hexagon Hamiltonian

We shall study the hexagon tunneling event described in the previous section in the absence of in-plane selection (i.e. taking $J_c = 0$), but in the presence of a coplanarity barrier of size J_b , that tends to keep the spins aligned with the reference plane. Our aim is to compute the tunnel splitting energy Δ . Since $J_b \sim sJ$, we have $J_b \ll s^2J$, when $s \gg 1$, and consequently we assume that only the six hexagon spins will move significantly during the hexagon tunneling event. Hence we take all other spins in the lattice to stay fixed, and adopt the following Hamiltonian for the six-spin hexagon system:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{hex}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{AFM}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}} , \quad (2.3)$$

$$\text{where} \quad \mathcal{H}_{\text{AFM}} = s^2 J \sum_{l=0}^5 [\mathbf{n}_l \cdot \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{n}_{l+1} \cdot \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{n}_l \cdot \mathbf{n}_{l+1} + \frac{3}{2}] , \quad (2.4)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}} = J_b f(\varphi_{\text{av}}) , \quad \text{where} \quad \varphi_{\text{av}} \equiv 1/6 \sum_{l=0}^5 (\varphi_l - \varphi_l(\text{initial})) . \quad (2.5)$$

The index l labels the six spins around the hexagon and is defined modulo 6 (see fig. ??). All spins are written in terms of the same coordinate system, in which the $\mathbf{z}$ -axis points in the C-direction, the xz -plane coincides with the reference plane, and φ is measured from the positive x -direction. $\mathcal{H}_{\text{AFM}}$ contains simply those terms from eq. (??) that involve the six hexagon spins and their six C-type nearest neighbors. A constant has been added to ensure that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{AFM}} = 0$ in the initial and final configurations $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$.

$\mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}}$ represents the coplanarity barrier that opposes hexagon tunneling. The function $f(\varphi)$ describes the shape of the barrier; it is of order unity and is sketched schematically in fig. ?. Its argument in eq. (??), φ_{av} , is a measure of the deviation of the plane of the near-rigid hexagon from the reference plane (in which $\varphi_B(-T/2) = 0$, $\varphi_A(-T/2) = \pi$).

Symmetry about the reference plane ensures that $f(\varphi)$ has the properties

$$f(m\pi) = 0 , \quad f(\varphi) = f(-\varphi) = f(\varphi + m\pi) \quad \text{for any integer } m . \quad (2.6)$$

At this stage it is not necessary to specify $f(\varphi)$ in more detail. An estimate of the actual form of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}}$ is made in appendix ??, and summarized in eq. (??). The suitability of using such a barrier is further discussed in section ??.

Intuitively, the six hexagon spins are expected to rotate collectively, almost as a rigid unit, maintaining the mutual coplanarity and relative angles of 120° required to minimize $\mathcal{H}_{\text{AFM}}$. In particular, for each of them $\cos \theta_l \simeq -\frac{1}{2}$ throughout the tunneling event, which is why we have taken $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}}$ to be independent of θ_l . Also, the expected mutual coplanarity of the tunneling spins is the reason why we have written $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}}$ as a function only of φ_{av}

(and not some more general function of the six φ_l 's [?]). These assumptions are found to be justified in section ??.

Evidently, due to reflection symmetry in the reference plane, two kinds of tunneling events between $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ are possible. They differ from each other only in the *sense* of rotation about the $\mathbf{z}$ -axis ($\varphi \leftrightarrow -\varphi$), and we shall call them (+)-instantons and (−)-instantons.

We shall show in section ?? how the hexagon tunneling problem defined above can be mapped onto a much simpler model problem. This involves only a single, collective spin degree of freedom with effective spin $6s$. Its coordinates, to be denoted by (Φ_o, Θ_o) , are formally defined in eqs. (??) and (??) and are suitable averages of the six individual (φ_i, θ_i) 's. The effective Hamiltonian turns out to be (see eq. (??)):

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = 12s^2 J(\cos \Theta_o + \frac{1}{2})^2 + J_b f(\Phi_o). \quad (2.7)$$

Rather than proceeding with the mapping of eq. (??) onto eq. (??) right away, in the next two sections we first discuss the simple model problem (based on eq. (??)) in detail, to establish notation and introduce the tools needed to calculate the tunnel splitting energy Δ .

III. A SIMPLE MODEL SYSTEM

In this section we introduce a simple model problem, which will be used to illustrate how a calculation of the tunnel splitting energy can be carried through. It is also the system onto which the Kagomé tunneling problem that is studied in section ?? can be mapped. We set up the relevant path integral, calculate the classical action and discuss the equations of motion and the typical form of the tunneling path.

A. Model Hamiltonian

The model system is defined by the following Euclidean single-spin Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L} = -i\hbar n s \dot{\varphi}(z - 1) + \mathcal{H} \quad (3.1)$$

$$\text{where} \quad \mathcal{H} = a(z - z_g)^2 + b f(\varphi); \quad (\text{with } b \ll a), \quad (3.2)$$

$$\text{and} \quad z \equiv \cos \theta. \quad (3.3)$$

This Lagrangian has been written in terms of the imaginary time parameter $\tau = it$ (hence “Euclidean”), since this is convenient for the calculation of tunneling amplitudes. The spherical coordinates $(\varphi, \theta) \equiv \Omega$ define a unit vector $\mathbf{n}$ and label a coherent spin state $|\varphi, \theta\rangle$ for a particle with spin ns . The dot on $\dot{\varphi}$ means ∂_τ (see [?] for a discussion of the origin of this term). The integer n is introduced in order to accommodate the possibility of a collective degree of freedom with effective spin ns . For the purpose of describing a single spin degree of freedom, take $n = 1$.

The “classical” Hamiltonian is the expectation value $\mathcal{H} \equiv \langle \varphi, \theta | \widehat{\mathcal{H}} | \varphi, \theta \rangle$ of the quantum operator $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$. Clearly $\mathcal{H}$ has been chosen to have the same form as $\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}$ of eq. (??); the constants a and b are of order $s^2 J$ and J_b respectively (see eq. (??), with $b \ll a$). The dominant term in $\mathcal{H}$ is an easy-plane anisotropy which would make every angle on the “latitude line”

$z = z_g$ on the unit sphere be degenerate; it mimics $\mathcal{H}_{\text{AFM}}$ in eq. (??) (which forced all six hexagon spins to have $\cos \theta_l = -\frac{1}{2}$). In the other term, $f(\varphi)$ is the same function as that in eqs. (??) and (??); it introduces a small anisotropy within the degenerate subspace and mimics $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}}$. There are two degenerate ground state configurations, $|i\rangle = |2m_1\pi, z_g\rangle$ and $|f\rangle = |(2m_2+1)\pi, z_g\rangle$, with m_1 and m_2 arbitrary integers (the different values of m_1 and m_2 describe the same physical state, of course). Contours of constant $\mathcal{H}$ are shown in fig. ??.

B. Tunneling amplitude

The tunnel splitting energy Δ that arises due to tunneling of the spin direction between $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ is proportional [?] to the tunneling amplitude

$$U_{fi} \equiv \langle f | e^{-\widehat{\mathcal{H}}T/\hbar} | i \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}\Omega e^{-\mathcal{S}/\hbar}, \quad (3.4)$$

where $\mathcal{S} = \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} d\tau \mathcal{L}$ is the Euclidean action, $\mathcal{D}\Omega$ is the path integral measure (discussed in section ??), and T is a large time. Such an amplitude can be approximately evaluated by the method of steepest descent:

$$U_{fi} = \sum_l \mathcal{N}^{(l)} e^{-\mathcal{S}_o^{(l)}/\hbar} \equiv U_{fi}^{(l)}. \quad (3.5)$$

Here $\mathcal{S}_o^{(l)}$ is the action evaluated along the l -th “tunneling path”, which is a solution to the Lagrangian equations of motion and for tunneling problems is in general complex. It will always be denoted by overlined variables, e.g. $(\overline{\varphi}^{(l)}, \overline{z}^{(l)})$. The index l allows for the possibility of different tunneling paths satisfying boundary conditions that differ in the indices m_1 and m_2 (but that all describe physically the same initial and final states) [?]. The prefactors

$$\mathcal{N}^{(l)} = \int \mathcal{D}\Omega e^{-(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_o^{(l)})/\hbar}. \quad (3.6)$$

are usually evaluated only (if at all) to lowest order in the steepest descent method, by transforming to the fluctuation variables $(\delta\varphi^{(l)}, \delta z^{(l)}) \equiv (\varphi - \overline{\varphi}^{(l)}, z - \overline{z}^{(l)})$ and keeping only the lowest term in the expansion $\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_o^{(l)} = \delta^2 \mathcal{S}^{(l)} + \delta^3 \mathcal{S}^{(l)} \dots$

In the present case, all tunneling paths connecting $|i\rangle$ at $\tau = -T/2$ to $|f\rangle$ at $\tau = T/2$, can be constructed from two very simple paths, to be denoted by $(\overline{\varphi}^\pm, \overline{z}^\pm)$. The first, for which $\overline{\varphi}^+(\tau) \in [0, \pi]$, we call a (+)-instanton, the second, for which $\overline{\varphi}^- = -\overline{\varphi}^+(\tau) \in [0, -\pi]$, a (-)-instanton. They differ solely in the sense of φ -rotation and are sketched in fig. ??. All other tunneling paths that approximately satisfy the equations of motion and contribute to eq. (??) are multi-instanton paths. They consist of n_1 (+)-instanton and n_2 (-)-instanton events, with $n_1 + n_2 = \text{odd}$, all assumed widely separated (relative to their characteristic width) in time, and following each other in arbitrary order (this is the so-called dilute-gas approximation, see Coleman [?]). In the following, we consider only single-instanton events (i.e. $l \rightarrow \pm$ in eq. (??)); the effects multi-instantons are taken into account in appendix ??.

The symmetry $\mathcal{H}(\varphi, z) = \mathcal{H}(-\varphi, z)$ of the Hamiltonian allows one to conclude immediately that $|U_{fi}^+| = |U_{fi}^-|$. This is intuitively obvious, and can be proven to hold exactly to all orders of the steepest descent approximation (i.e. to all orders in $1/s$) (see section ??).

Intuitively speaking, the symmetry of $\mathcal{H}$ ensures that the local neighborhoods of the two tunneling paths $(\bar{\varphi}^+, \bar{z}^+)$ and $(\bar{\varphi}^-, \bar{z}^-)$ are identical for the two paths, so that the local shapes and sizes of the barriers (which determine $\text{Re}[\mathcal{S}_o^{(l)}]$) and the local fluctuations around the tunneling paths (which determine $|\mathcal{N}^{(l)}|$), are identical. However, the amplitudes $U_{fi}^\pm$ can differ by a phase, which may lead to destructive interference between them.

C. Classical action, continuing to complex coordinates

Let us find $\mathcal{S}_o^\pm$, the classical action for single-instanton events. Since energy is conserved along any path that extremizes the action, $\mathcal{H}(\bar{\varphi}^\pm, \bar{z}^\pm) = 0$. Solving for $\bar{z}^\pm$ as a function of $\bar{\varphi}$, one obtains

$$i\bar{Z}^\pm \equiv \bar{z}^\pm - z_g = \pm i\sqrt{b/a} \sqrt{f(\bar{\varphi}^\pm)}, \quad (3.7)$$

with $\bar{Z}^\pm$ real. The Euclidean action is easily evaluated along these paths by changing variables from τ to $\bar{\varphi}^\pm$ and using $f(\bar{\varphi}^+) = f(\bar{\varphi}^-)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_o^\pm &= -i\hbar ns \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} d\tau (\partial_\tau \bar{\varphi}^\pm) (z_g + i\bar{Z}^\pm - 1) + 0 \\ &= \mp i\hbar ns \pi (z_g - 1) + \hbar ns \sqrt{b/a} \int_0^\pi d\varphi \sqrt{f(\bar{\varphi}^+)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Note that the quantity $\sqrt{b/a}$ plays the role of an effective barrier size for the tunneling process. This is intuitively plausible. The barrier height in the φ direction is measured by b . When $(z - z_g)$ is real, a measures the steepness of the valley in the z -direction. When $(z - z_g)$ becomes purely imaginary ($(z - z_g)^2 \rightarrow -(z - z_g)^2$), the z -valley turns into a ridge (see fig. ??). The motion occurs along a constant energy contour around this ridge (see fig. ??b), and $1/a$ measures the width of the ridge. Hence, b/a measures the effective barrier size.

D. Possible cancellation due to phase factors

We show in section ?? that $\mathcal{N}^+ = \mathcal{N}^-$ (under some technical assumptions, explained there). The sum of the two amplitudes $U_{fi}^\pm$ is therefore simply

$$\begin{aligned} U_{fi}^+ + U_{fi}^- &= U_{fi}^+ (1 + e^{\mathcal{S}_o^+ - \mathcal{S}_o^- / \hbar}) \\ &= U_{fi}^+ (1 + e^{-i\pi l}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

where the constant $l \equiv 2ns(z_g - 1)$ is not necessarily an integer. The relative phase of $e^{-i\pi l}$ between the amplitudes of two tunneling paths that connect the same initial and final states has a well-known geometrical interpretation. It is related to the area enclosed on the unit sphere between the two paths $(\varphi^+(\tau), \text{Re}[\theta^+(\tau)])$ and $(\varphi^-(\tau), \text{Re}[\theta^-(\tau)])$. (See [?] for more comments on this aspect). Now, *if l is an odd integer*, the (+)-instanton and (-)-instanton paths interfere destructively and their amplitudes add to zero: $U_{fi}^+ + U_{fi}^- = 0$ [?]. Note that as long as the barrier does not violate the symmetry between (+)-instantons and (-)-instantons, this cancellation does not depend on the particular shape of the barrier, since the shape function $f(\varphi)$ only affects the real part of $\mathcal{S}_o$, which cancels out in $\mathcal{S}_o^+ - \mathcal{S}_o^-$.

E. Equations of motion and tunneling path

It was not necessary to solve the equations of motion to obtain the explicit expression eq. (??) for the classical action. For future reference, the equations of motion are:

$$-i\hbar n s i\dot{\overline{Z}} = b f'(\overline{\varphi}) , \quad (3.10)$$

$$-i\hbar n s \dot{\overline{\varphi}} + 2a i\overline{Z} = 0 . \quad (3.11)$$

The prime on f means $\partial/\partial\varphi$. Note how the i of $i\overline{Z}$ and that originating from $\tau = it$ combine to result in consistent equations of motion (this is a direct illustration of why it is useful to employ imaginary time in tunneling calculations). Eliminating $\overline{Z}$, we get

$$\ddot{\overline{\varphi}} = \frac{1}{2}d^2 f'(\overline{\varphi}) , \quad \text{where} \quad d^2 = \frac{4ab}{(\hbar n s)^2} . \quad (3.12)$$

The constant d has the dimensions of inverse time, and $1/d$ characterizes the width of an instanton. To illustrate the nature of the solutions of eq.(??), consider the simple case where $f(\varphi) = \sin^2 \varphi$. Then eq.(??) is just the sine-Gordon equation, whose solutions, in the limit $T \rightarrow \infty$, are:

$$\overline{\varphi}^+(\tau) = 2 \arctan(e^{d\tau}) , \quad \overline{\varphi}^-(\tau) = -\overline{\varphi}^+(\tau) = \overline{\varphi}^+(-\tau) - \pi . \quad (3.13)$$

These represent (+)-instanton and (-)-instanton events and are sketched in fig. ??. The shape of an instanton changes quantitatively, but not qualitatively, if a different barrier shape function is used.

IV. THE TUNNEL SPLITTING ENERGY Δ

For integer s , for which the (+)-instanton and (-)-instanton amplitudes have the same sign and interfere constructively, the resulting tunnel splitting energy Δ can be calculated from the prefactor of eq. (??):

$$\mathcal{N}^\pm = \int \mathcal{D}\Omega e^{-(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_o^\pm)/\hbar} . \quad (4.1)$$

This can be accomplished via three steps:

- (i) Extending the integration ranges for φ and z in the path integral to infinity;
- (ii) Integrating out the z -degree of freedom;
- (ii) Using standard methods to evaluate the resulting φ -path integral.

A. Extending the integration ranges

The path integral expression eq. (??) for the tunneling amplitude (in real time) can be arrived at by the usual procedure of discretizing time and inserting completeness relations in spin space at each time slice (see, e.g. [?,?]). This procedure leads to a formal expression for the measure (appropriate for any spin problem):

$$\int \mathcal{D}\Omega(t) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{2s+1}{4\pi} \right)^N \prod_{j=1}^N \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi(\tau_j) \int_{-1}^1 dz(\tau_j) , \quad (4.2)$$

where $\varepsilon(N+1) = T$. What distinguishes this measure from the ones usually encountered in particle tunneling problems is the fact that φ and z have finite integration ranges. In a somewhat cavalier fashion, we extend these to $[-\infty, \infty]$ and $[-\infty, \infty]$ and absorb the change in normalization by multiplying by an extra overall normalization factor C . The extension of the range for φ from $[0, 2\pi]$ to $[-\infty, \infty]$ is very natural – it allows for motion in which the spin direction rotates around in the same direction many times. The justification for extending the integration range $[-r, r]$ for z from $r = 1$ to $r = \infty$ is more tenuous. The core of the argument is the following assertion, proven in appendix ?? : In the presence of a z^2 -term in the Hamiltonian, the value of r determines the degree of non-differentiability (“wildness”) of the φ -paths that result after z has been integrated out: if $r = \infty$, the φ -paths are Brownian motion paths; if $r = 1$, they are much more ill-behaved than Brownian motion paths. Therefore, changing the integration range for z from $r = 1$ to $r = \infty$ is equivalent to restricting attention to Brownian motion φ -paths instead of a larger class of paths that are much more ill-behaved. It is argued that this should not have a noticeable effect, for the following two reasons: if one is interested mainly in the effect of small fluctuations around the classical path (as, for example, when calculating the tunnel splitting energy), physically, one only expects some *smooth* paths in the immediate neighborhood of the classical path to be important. Also, the additional paths that are formally included in the path integral when the integration ranges are extended from $r = 1$ to $r = \infty$ are far from the tunneling path and therefore only make an exponentially small contribution to the path integral.

In the course of making a change of variables $(\varphi, z) \rightarrow (\delta\varphi, \delta z)$ in the path integral in order to evaluate $\mathcal{N}^\pm$, the overall constant C will be multiplied by a Jacobian factor J^N , which may be infinite in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. To obtain finite answers, we stipulate, as is usual, that C be chosen such that the final path integral for $\delta\varphi$ (after the δz -dependence has been integrated out), should have the same normalization as that employed by Coleman in his discussion of instantons [?], the results of which we intend to use. This often-used procedure may seem somewhat arbitrary, but the fact that the path integral is defined as an infinite *product* of integrals, each of which may produce finite prefactors when being manipulated, leaves one no choice but to absorb all infinities in a single appropriately chosen constant C . This much having been said, we henceforth pay no attention to normalization constants or Jacobians.

B. The relative phase of the prefactors $\mathcal{N}^+$ and $\mathcal{N}^-$

Before integrating out z , let us investigate the relative phase of $\mathcal{N}^+$ and $\mathcal{N}^-$, the (+)-instanton and (−)-instanton prefactors. The quantity $\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_o$ that appears in the integrands of the prefactors in eq. (??) can be written in terms of the fluctuations around the tunneling path, $(\delta\varphi, \delta z) \equiv (\varphi - \overline{\varphi}, z - \overline{z})$, as

$$\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_o = \int d\tau \left[-i\hbar n s \dot{\varphi} \delta z + a \delta z^2 + b \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{\partial^n}{\partial \varphi^n} f(\varphi) \right) \Big|_{\overline{\varphi}} \delta \varphi^n \right] . \quad (4.3)$$

Evidently, because $f(\varphi) = f(-\varphi)$, the following symmetry relations hold (the square brackets denote a functional dependence, “*” denotes complex conjugation):

$$(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_o)[\bar{\varphi}^-, -\delta\varphi, \delta z] = (\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_o)^*[\bar{\varphi}^+, \delta\varphi, \delta z] , \quad (4.4)$$

$$(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_o)[\bar{\varphi}^-, -\delta\varphi, -\delta z] = (\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_o)[\bar{\varphi}^+, \delta\varphi, \delta z] . \quad (4.5)$$

Now, after the change of variables $(\varphi, z) \rightarrow (\delta\varphi, \delta z)$ in the path integral (??), $\delta\varphi$ and δz are dummy variables that are integrated over. Since we extended the integration ranges for φ and z to $[-\infty, \infty]$, the integration ranges for $\delta\varphi$ and δz are symmetric around $\delta\varphi = 0$ and $\delta z = 0$. Hence the following conclusions follow immediately:

- (i) Relation (??) implies that $\mathcal{N}^- = \mathcal{N}^{+*}$.
- (ii) Relation (??) implies that $\mathcal{N}^- = \mathcal{N}^+$.

As discussed in section ??, the extension of the integration range to $[-\infty, \infty]$ is on somewhat less firm ground for z than for φ . Hence conclusion (ii), which holds only if the δz -integration range is symmetric about $\delta z = 0$, is in a sense “weaker” than conclusion (i). However, even if the original z -integration range of $[-1, 1]$ is retained, the error in the relation $\mathcal{N}^+ = \mathcal{N}^-$ is expected to be exponentially small. For example, for the case $z_g = -\frac{1}{2}$, which we shall use in section ??, only paths for which $\delta z \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$ break the $\delta z \leftrightarrow -\delta z$ symmetry, and these paths deviate so strongly from the tunneling path (for which $\text{Re}[z] = z_g$) that their contribution to the path integral is exponentially small. (Of course, this argument breaks down when $z_g = \pm 1$.)

Finally, note that within the lowest order of the steepest descent approximation, in which one keeps only the $n = 2$ term of the infinite sum in eq. (??) (to be indicated by a superscript (2) in eq. (??) below), the relation $\mathcal{N}^+ = \mathcal{N}^-$ holds, *independent* of the range of z -integration. The reason is simply that since

$$(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_o)^{(2)} = \int d\tau \left[-i\hbar s \dot{\varphi} \delta z + a \delta z^2 + \frac{1}{2} b f''(\bar{\varphi}) \delta \varphi^2 \right] , \quad (4.6)$$

where $f'' = \partial^2 f / \partial \varphi^2$, we have

$$(\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_o)^{(2)}[\bar{\varphi}^+, \delta\varphi, \delta z] = (\mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}_o)^{(2)}[\bar{\varphi}^-, \delta\varphi, \delta z] . \quad (4.7)$$

C. Calculating Δ

We henceforth restrict attention to the lowest order of the steepest descent approximation, in which $\mathcal{N}^+ = \mathcal{N}^- \equiv \mathcal{N}$. It is straightforward, starting from eq. (??), to perform the Gaussian integral over δz to arrive at

$$\mathcal{N} \propto \int \mathcal{D}\delta\varphi e^{-\int d\tau \delta^2 \mathcal{L}_\varphi / \hbar} , \quad (4.8)$$

$$\text{where} \quad \delta^2 \mathcal{L}_\varphi = \frac{1}{2} b f''(\bar{\varphi}) (\delta\varphi)^2 + \frac{(\hbar n s)^2}{4a} (\dot{\delta\varphi})^2 . \quad (4.9)$$

Now note that the $\delta^2 \mathcal{L}_\varphi$ of eq. (??) is also the second variation of the following effective Euclidean Lagrangian for φ :

$$\mathcal{L}_\varphi = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\hbar n s)^2}{2a} \dot{\varphi}^2 + b f(\varphi) . \quad (4.10)$$

The Lagrangian equation of motion resulting from $\mathcal{L}_\varphi$ is just eq. (??), and hence the $\mathcal{S}_o$ corresponding to $\mathcal{L}_\varphi$ will be equal to the $\text{Re}[\mathcal{S}_o]$ found earlier. Consequently, both $\mathcal{N}$ and $\text{Re}[\mathcal{S}_o]$ for the original system are equal to those arising from $\mathcal{L}_\varphi$. It follows that Δ , too, can be calculated directly using $\mathcal{L}_\varphi$. Furthermore, $\mathcal{L}_\varphi$ is quadratic in $\delta\varphi$ and therefore the methods discussed by Coleman [?] can be used to calculate the tunnel splitting energy. Coleman's methods, which are summarized in appendix ??, readily lead to the following expression for Δ (compare eqs. (??) and (??)):

$$\Delta = 2\varphi_{\text{as}}(\pi n s)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (b f''(0))^{\frac{3}{4}} (2a)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(e^{-\mathcal{S}_o^+/\hbar} + e^{-\mathcal{S}_o^-/\hbar} \right) . \quad (4.11)$$

Here the constant φ_{as} is to be read off from the asymptotic behavior of the tunneling paths, which, as Coleman shows, can always be written in the form (compare eq. (??):

$$\overline{\varphi}^\pm(\tau) \simeq \pm\pi \mp \varphi_{\text{as}} e^{-\omega\tau} , \quad \text{with } \omega \equiv \frac{\sqrt{2abf''(0)}}{\hbar n s} , \quad (4.12)$$

Eq. (??) is the main result of this section. We emphasize once again that Δ is strictly zero if $S_o^+ - S_o^- = i\hbar l\pi$, with l an odd integer, since then (+)-instanton and (-)-instanton events interfere destructively.

To find φ_{as} explicitly, one needs some knowledge of the asymptotic behavior of the shape function $f(\varphi)$ of the potential as $\varphi \rightarrow 0$. According to eqs. (??), (??) and (??) in appendix D, the form of $f(\varphi)$ that is applicable to the hexagon tunneling problem to be studied in the latter parts of this paper is:

$$f(\varphi) = \tilde{f}\left(\sqrt{\varphi_{\text{eff}}^2 + \varphi^{*2}}\right) - \tilde{f}(\varphi^*) , \quad \varphi_{\text{eff}} \equiv \varphi \bmod \pi \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2] , \quad (4.13)$$

$$\text{where} \quad \tilde{f}(\varphi) = |\sin \varphi| (1 + \frac{1}{9} \sin^2 \varphi)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \tilde{J} \sin^2 \varphi . \quad (4.14)$$

Here $\tilde{J} \simeq 0.42$ and $\varphi^* = 0.14 s^{-1/3}$. In the limit $s \gg 1$, φ^* can be treated as a small parameter which characterizes the curvature of the potential at $\varphi = 0$, since $f''(0) = (1/\varphi^* - 2\tilde{J})$.

“Energy conservation” along the tunneling path implies for the $\mathcal{L}_\varphi$ of eq. (??) that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{(\hbar n s)^2}{2a} \dot{\overline{\varphi}}^2 - b f(\overline{\varphi}) = 0 . \quad (4.15)$$

Integrating this equation gives, for an (-)-instanton,

$$\tau \omega (f''(0))^{-\frac{1}{2}} = - \int_{-\pi/2}^{-\pi+\overline{\varphi}_\tau} \frac{d\overline{\varphi}}{[2f(\overline{\varphi})]^{\frac{1}{2}}} , \quad (4.16)$$

where $-\pi + \bar{\varphi}_\tau$ is the angle reached at time τ if $\bar{\varphi} = 0$ at $\tau = 0$. This equation is to be solved for $\bar{\varphi}_\tau$ as a function of τ , in the limit $\bar{\varphi}_\tau \rightarrow 0$. In particular, we take $\bar{\varphi}_\tau \ll \eta\varphi^*$, where $\eta \ll 1$ is an arbitrary small parameter (e.g. $\eta = 0.01$).

It is convenient to split the integral into two parts by writing

$$\tau\omega(f''(0))^{-\frac{1}{2}} = F(\pi/2) - F(\bar{\varphi}_\tau) , \quad (4.17)$$

$$\text{where} \quad F(\varphi) \equiv \int_{\eta\varphi^*}^{\varphi} \frac{d\bar{\varphi}}{[2f(\bar{\varphi})]^{\frac{1}{2}}} , \quad (4.18)$$

and the property $f(\varphi) = f(\varphi + \pi)$ has been exploited. Since $\bar{\varphi}_\tau \ll \eta\varphi^* \ll 1$, one may evaluate $F(\bar{\varphi}_\tau)$ analytically by using the asymptotic form of the integrand, namely $f(\varphi \rightarrow 0) \simeq \varphi^2(1/2\varphi^* - \tilde{J})$, with the result

$$F(\bar{\varphi}_\tau) = \left(\frac{\varphi^*}{1 - 2\tilde{J}\varphi^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\ln\varphi - \ln\eta\varphi^*) . \quad (4.19)$$

Using this result in eq. (??) and solving for $\bar{\varphi}_\tau$ gives

$$\bar{\varphi}_\tau = \varphi_{\text{as}} e^{-\omega\tau} , \quad (4.20)$$

$$\text{where} \quad \varphi_{\text{as}} = \exp \left[C \left(\frac{1 - 2\tilde{J}\varphi^*}{\varphi^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \quad (4.21)$$

$$\text{and} \quad C \equiv F(\pi/2) + \left(\frac{\varphi^*}{1 - 2\tilde{J}\varphi^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \ln\eta\varphi^* \quad (4.22)$$

The constant C is independent of η , since the η -dependence of $F(\pi/2)$ cancels that of the second term. Moreover, C is only very weakly dependent on φ^* and hence on s , and approaches a constant value as $s \rightarrow \infty$. (Numerically it is found that C changes from 1.1 to 2.1 as s changes from 1 to ∞ .) Hence, recalling that $\varphi^* = 0.14s^{-\frac{1}{3}}$, we conclude that in the limit $s \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\varphi_{\text{as}} \simeq e^{5.6 s^{\frac{1}{6}}} . \quad (4.23)$$

This expression diverges as $s \rightarrow \infty$, but in eq. (??) it premultiplies an expression that tends to zero even faster as $s \rightarrow \infty$ (in section ??, we find $\mathcal{S}_o \sim s^{1/2}$, see eq. (??) and eq. (??)).

V. SPIN TUNNELING IN THE KAGOMÉ LATTICE

The stage has now been set for the study of the hexagon tunneling event on the Kagomé-lattice, for which we adopted the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\text{hex}}$ defined in eqs. (??) to (??). Rewriting $\mathcal{H}_{\text{AFM}}$ in terms of φ_l and $z_l \equiv \cos\theta_l$, the Euclidean Lagrangian to be studied is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \sum_{l=0}^5 -i\hbar s \dot{\varphi}_l (z_l - 1) + J_b f(\varphi_{\text{av}}) \\ & + s^2 J \sum_{l=0}^5 [z_l + z_{l+1} + z_l z_{l+1} + C_l \cos(\varphi_l - \varphi_{l+1}) + \frac{3}{2}] , \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

$$\text{where } C_l \equiv \sin \theta_l \sin \theta_{l+1} = \{(1 - z_l^2)(1 - z_{l+1}^2)\}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (5.2)$$

The tunneling event was described in intuitive terms in section ???. The initial and final states are:

$$|i\rangle : \quad \varphi_l(-T/2) = (0, \pi, 0, \pi, 0, \pi); \quad z_l(-T/2) = z_g. \quad (5.3)$$

$$|f\rangle : \quad \varphi_l(T/2) = (\pi, 0, \pi, 0, \pi, 0); \quad z_l(T/2) = z_g. \quad (5.4)$$

Here $z_g = \cos 2\pi/3 = -\frac{1}{2}$. The motion of each of the six spins will be roughly analogous to the single-spin motion described in section ??.

A. Collective coordinates

We now introduce a coordinate transformation to a set of collective coordinates, (Φ_l, Z_l) , which ultimately allows us to map the hexagon tunneling problem exactly onto the simple model problem of section ??, eqs. (??) and (??):

$$z_l - z_l(-T/2) = \sum_{k=0}^5 e^{i\pi l k/3} i Z_k, \quad (5.5)$$

$$\varphi_l - \varphi_l(-T/2) = \sum_{k=0}^5 e^{-i\pi l k/3} \Phi_k, \quad (5.6)$$

$$\text{where } \Phi_l^* = \Phi_{-l}, \quad Z_l^* = Z_{-l}. \quad (5.7)$$

The conditions (??) ensure that $\varphi_l - \varphi_l(-T/2)$ is purely real and $z_l - z_l(-T/2)$ purely imaginary. The reason for the latter requirement is the same as that encountered in the discussion of the model tunneling problem (section ??): it would otherwise be impossible to satisfy $\mathcal{H} = 0$. Making $z_l - z_l(-T/2)$ imaginary flips the sign of the z^2 -terms, thus turning the z -valley into a ridge around which the tunneling path can proceed along a constant energy contour.

The new coordinates are essentially discrete Fourier transforms of the original ones with respect to l . (Indices such as l and k will be used interchangeably both as “position” labels (for φ and z) and as Fourier labels (for Φ and Z .) The zeroth ones, (Φ_o, Z_o) , are just the average values of the old coordinates and can be thought of as the coordinates of a collective degree of freedom (of spin 6s, as it turns out). They will be referred to as the *tunneling coordinates*, since Φ_o tunnels from 0 at $\tau = -T/2$ to $\pm\pi$ at $\tau = T/2$, and iZ_o is its conjugate momentum. The other coordinates (Φ_l, Z_l) , $l = 1, \dots, 5$, will be called *transverse coordinates*, since they will be shown to be strictly zero along the tunneling path, and hence describe fluctuations that are orthogonal to the tunneling path.

In order to calculate the tunnel splitting energy Δ , one needs the classical action $\mathcal{S}_o \pm$ and the prefactor $\mathcal{N}^\pm$. In the following two sections, we show that both these quantities can be obtained from a rather simple *effective* Lagrangian, $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$, that depends *only* on the tunneling coordinates (Φ_o, Z_o) , so that the problem is substantially simplified. This Lagrangian, defined in eq.(??) and given explicitly in eq.(??), turns out to have just the form of the Lagrangian introduced in section ??, with (Φ_o, Z_o) corresponding to φ, z there.

B. Classical action (Kagomé lattice)

The classical action is completely determined by the tunneling path, for which, as in section ??, we again use overlined variables, $(\overline{\varphi}_l, \overline{z}_l)$ or $(\overline{\Phi}_l, \overline{Z}_l)$. This path is determined by the equations of motion, which, by the chain rule, can be written in terms of the new coordinates as:

$$\partial_\tau \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\varphi}_l} \right)_t \left(\frac{\partial \dot{\varphi}_l}{\partial \dot{\Phi}_k} \right)_t = \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_l} \right)_t \left(\frac{\partial \varphi_l}{\partial \Phi_k} \right)_t , \quad (5.8)$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial z_l} \right)_t \left(\frac{\partial z_l}{\partial Z_k} \right)_t = 0 , \quad (5.9)$$

with boundary conditions $\overline{\Phi}(-T/2) = 0$ and $\overline{Z}(-T/2) = 0$. The bracket $()_t$ indicates that the derivatives are to be evaluated along the tunneling path. These equations can be solved by the following “tunneling path Ansatz”:

$$(\overline{\Phi}_l, \overline{Z}_l) \equiv (0, 0) , \quad \text{for } l = 1, \dots, 5 . \quad (5.10)$$

To see that this Ansatz works, consider eqs. (??) and (??) term by term:

$$\partial_\tau \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\varphi}_l} \right)_t \left(\frac{\partial \dot{\varphi}_l}{\partial \dot{\Phi}_k} \right)_t = -i\hbar s \dot{\overline{z}}_l e^{-i\pi l k/3} ; \quad (5.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_l} \right)_t \left(\frac{\partial \varphi_l}{\partial \Phi_k} \right)_t &= \left\{ s^2 J \left[-C_l \sin(\overline{\varphi}_l - \overline{\varphi}_{l+1}) + C_{l-1} \sin(\overline{\varphi}_{l-1} - \overline{\varphi}_l) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{6} J_b f'(\varphi_{\text{av}}) \right\} e^{-i\pi l k/3} ; \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial z_l} \right)_t \left(\frac{\partial z_l}{\partial Z_k} \right)_t &= \left\{ s^2 J \left[\overline{z}_{l+1} + \overline{z}_{l-1} + 2 + \sum_{m=0}^5 \left(\frac{\partial C_m}{\partial z_l} \right)_t \cos(\overline{\varphi}_m - \overline{\varphi}_{m+1}) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - i\hbar s \dot{\overline{\varphi}}_l \right\} i e^{i\pi l k/3} ; \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

with

$$\left(\frac{\partial C_m}{\partial z_l} \right)_t = -\frac{1}{C_m} \left[\overline{z}_m (1 - \overline{z}_{m+1}^2) \delta_{ml} + \overline{z}_{m+1} (1 - \overline{z}_m^2) \delta_{m+1l} \right] . \quad (5.14)$$

Now express $(\overline{\varphi}_l, \overline{z}_l)$, wherever they occur, in terms of $(\overline{\Phi}_l, \overline{Z}_l)$. Using the tunneling path Ansatz (??) repeatedly, it readily follows that

$$\overline{z}_l = i\overline{Z}_o + z_g \equiv \overline{Z}_c ; \quad \overline{\varphi}_l = \overline{\Phi}_o + \varphi_o(-T/2) ; \quad (5.15)$$

$$\text{whence} \quad \varphi_{\text{av}} = \overline{\Phi}_o , \quad \overline{\varphi}_l - \overline{\varphi}_{l+1} = \pi , \quad (5.16)$$

$$\sum_{m=o}^5 \left(\frac{\partial C_m}{\partial z_l} \right)_t = -2\overline{Z}_c . \quad (5.17)$$

This means that eqs. (??) to (??) depend on the index l *only* through the factors of $e^{\pm i\pi l k/3}$. Since $\sum_{l=0}^5 e^{\pm i\pi l k/3} = 6\delta_{k0}$, these equations simplify considerably to become

$$-i\hbar s i\dot{\overline{Z}}_o \delta_{0k} = \frac{1}{6} J_b f'(\overline{\Phi}_o) \delta_{0k} , \quad (5.18)$$

$$i\hbar s \dot{\overline{\Phi}}_o \delta_{0k} = 4s^2 J i\overline{Z}_o \delta_{0k} . \quad (5.19)$$

where $z_g = -\frac{1}{2}$ has been used. Evidently, the equations of motion for the transverse coordinates ($k \neq 0$) trivially reduce to zero, and *only* the tunneling coordinates $\overline{\Phi}_o$ and $\overline{Z}_o$ have non-trivial behavior.

This allows us to introduce a considerable simplification: Write $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ for the function that results when $\mathcal{L}$ is expressed in terms of the new coordinates:

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}(\Phi_o, Z_o; \dots; \Phi_5, Z_5) \equiv \mathcal{L}(\{\varphi_k(\{\Phi_l\}), z_k(\{Z_l\})\}) . \quad (5.20)$$

Define an *effective* Lagrangian $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$, that depends only on the tunneling coordinates, by the relation

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o(\Phi_o, Z_o) \equiv \hat{\mathcal{L}}(\Phi_o, Z_o; 0, 0; \dots, 0, 0) . \quad (5.21)$$

Now, the behavior of the tunneling coordinates $\overline{\Phi}_o$ and $\overline{Z}_o$ can be found directly via the effective Lagrangian $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$, instead of the full $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$. This follows because the equations of motion for $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$ are exactly eqs. (??) and (??), essentially by definition, since $\left(\frac{\partial \hat{\mathcal{L}}}{\partial \overline{Z}_o}\right)_t$, evaluated according to the tunneling path Ansatz eq. (??), is *identically* equal to $\left(\frac{\partial \hat{\mathcal{L}}_o}{\partial \overline{Z}_o}\right)_t$, with similar comments holding for $\left(\frac{\partial \hat{\mathcal{L}}_o}{\partial \overline{\Phi}_o}\right)_t$ and $\left(\frac{\partial \hat{\mathcal{L}}}{\partial \overline{\Phi}_o}\right)_t$. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{S}_o$ depends solely on the tunneling path, it too can be calculated directly from $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$. The effective Lagrangian $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$ can be found from eq. (??) to be:

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o(\Phi_o, Z_o) = -i\hbar 6s(\dot{\Phi}_o)(Z_o - 1) + 12s^2 J(Z_o - z_g)^2 + J_b f(\Phi_o) . \quad (5.22)$$

It is from this expression that $\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}$ of eq. (??) was obtained. Evidently $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$ has just the form of the Lagrangian of eq. (??), with

$$n = 6; \quad a = 12s^2 J; \quad b = J_b; \quad z_g = -\frac{1}{2} . \quad (5.23)$$

Consequently, all the results from section ?? are applicable. The classical action, from eq. (??), is

$$\mathcal{S}_o^\pm = \pm 9i\hbar s\pi + \hbar s \sqrt{\frac{3J_b}{Js^2}} \int_0^\pi d\varphi \sqrt{f(\overline{\varphi}^+)} . \quad (5.24)$$

From the above expression for the classical action one can immediately read off the most striking result of this paper:

$$e^{-\mathcal{S}_o^+/\hbar} + e^{-\mathcal{S}_o^-/\hbar} = \begin{cases} -2 \exp \left[-\sqrt{3J_b/J} \int_0^\pi d\varphi \sqrt{f(\overline{\varphi}^+)} \right] & \text{if } s = \text{integer} , \\ 0 & \text{if } s = \text{half-odd-integer} . \end{cases} \quad (5.25)$$

Thus, if s is half-odd-integer, the (+)-instanton and (−)-instanton amplitudes interfere destructively, and the total tunneling amplitude is zero (for a discussion and extension of this result, see section ??).

C. The prefactor (Kagomé lattice)

The calculation of the prefactor involves the evaluation of the path integral

$$\int \prod_{l=0}^5 \mathcal{D}\Omega_l e^{-\int d\tau \delta^2 \mathcal{L} / \hbar} . \quad (5.26)$$

where the second variation of the action is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^2 \mathcal{L} = & \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial z_m \partial z_n} \right)_t \delta z_m \delta z_n + \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\varphi}_m \partial z_n} \right)_t \delta \dot{\varphi}_m \delta z_n \\ & + \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_m \partial z_n} \right)_t \delta \varphi_m \delta z_n + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_m \partial \varphi_n} \right)_t \delta \varphi_m \delta \varphi_n . \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

The deviations around the tunneling path, defined by

$$\delta z_l \equiv z_l - \bar{z}_l \equiv e^{i\pi l k / 3} \delta Z_k , \quad (5.28)$$

$$\delta \varphi_l \equiv \varphi_l - \bar{\varphi}_l \equiv e^{-i\pi l k / 3} \delta \Phi_k , \quad (5.29)$$

are taken to be purely real (it is only the tunneling path itself that has to become complex to minimize the action). Thus, their Fourier transforms obey the conditions $\delta \Phi_l^* = \delta \Phi_{-l}$ and $\delta Z_l^* = \delta Z_{-l}$.

Now, it can be verified that

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\varphi}_m \partial z_n} \right)_t = -i\hbar s \delta_{mn} ; \quad \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_m \partial z_n} \right)_t = 0 , \quad (5.30)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial z_m \partial z_n} \right)_t = \frac{1}{2} J s^2 \left\{ 2\delta_{mn} \frac{1}{1 - \bar{Z}_c^2} + (\delta_{mn+1} + \delta_{m+1n}) \left(1 - \frac{\bar{Z}_c^2}{1 - \bar{Z}_c^2} \right) \right\} \quad (5.31)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varphi_m \partial \varphi_n} \right)_t = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{36} J_b f''(\bar{\Phi}_o) + \frac{1}{2} s^2 J (1 - \bar{Z}_c^2) [2\delta_{mn} - \delta_{m+1n} - \delta_{mn+1}] . \quad (5.32)$$

Obtaining the actual numerical coefficients in eqs. (??) and (??) is somewhat tedious; however, the fact that the m, n -dependence enters only via δ -functions of the form δ_{mn+k} , which is all that is needed for the following argument, can be anticipated directly from the fact that the original $\mathcal{L}$ of eqs. (??) to (??) is “translationally invariant” (i.e. invariant under $l \rightarrow l + 1$). Now, when writing $\delta^2 \mathcal{L}$ of eq. (??) in terms of the Fourier transform variables $(\delta \Phi_l, \delta Z_l)$ of eqs. (??) and (??), one may utilize the relation

$$\sum_{mn=0}^5 \delta_{mn+k} \delta z_m \delta z_n = 6 \sum_{l=0}^5 e^{i\pi l k / 3} \delta Z_l \delta Z_{-l} , \quad (5.33)$$

which is essentially a consequence of the convolution theorem for discrete Fourier transformations. Using eqs. (??) to (??) in eq. (??), it follows directly that the variables $(\delta \Phi_o, \delta Z_o)$ decouple completely from the others in $\delta^2 \mathcal{L}$ [?]. Hence the path integral (??) factorizes into a product, say $I_1 I_2$, of two independent path integrals. I_1 depends only on $(\delta \Phi_o, \delta Z_o)$, the variations of the tunneling coordinates around their tunneling path values:

$$I_1 = \int \mathcal{D}(\delta \Omega_o) e^{-\int d\tau \delta^2 \hat{\mathcal{L}}_o / \hbar} . \quad (5.34)$$

In writing this equation, another shortcut has been employed: $\delta^2 \hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$ is the second variation of the simple Lagrangian $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$ of eq. (??), namely

$$\delta^2 \hat{\mathcal{L}}_o = -i\hbar 6s \delta\dot{\Phi}_o \delta Z_o + 12s^2 J \delta Z^2 + \frac{1}{2} J_b f''(\bar{\Phi}_o) \delta\Phi_o^2. \quad (5.35)$$

This simple form may be used since $\left(\frac{\partial^2 \hat{\mathcal{L}}}{\partial^2 Z_o}\right)_t$, evaluated according to the tunneling path Ansatz (??), is *identically* equal to $\left(\frac{\partial^2 \hat{\mathcal{L}}_o}{\partial^2 Z_o}\right)_t$, with similar comments holding for the other second derivatives of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$ with respect to the Φ_o and Z_o .

The other path integral, I_2 , depends only on $(\delta\Phi_l, \delta Z_l)_{l \neq 0}$, the variations of the transverse coordinates around their zero values along the tunneling path. These fluctuations are exactly harmonic oscillators in the limit $\frac{J_b}{s^2 J} \rightarrow 0$, since then all time dependence drops out of the coefficients in eqs. (??) to (??) (recall that $\bar{Z}_c = i\bar{Z}_o + z_g$, with $i\delta Z_o \propto \sqrt{b/a} \propto \sqrt{J_b/s^2 J}$). More generally, the fluctuations of the transverse coordinates will shift the ground state energy by an amount proportional to their characteristic frequencies. However, they will *not* make a contribution to the tunnel splitting energy Δ .

Thus, for the calculation of Δ , only the path integral I_1 is relevant. Since this depends only on $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$, the demonstration that only $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$ is important for the calculation of Δ is complete.

It follows that Δ may be directly obtained from the effective Lagrangian $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_o$ of section ??, eq. (??), inserted into the results of section ??. Substituting the values of eq. (??) and (??) into eq. (??) gives

$$\Delta = \begin{cases} 4 \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_{\text{as}}(J_b f''(0))^{\frac{3}{4}} J^{\frac{1}{4}} \exp\left[-\sqrt{3J_b/J} \int_0^\pi d\varphi \sqrt{f(\varphi)}\right] & \text{if } s = \text{integer} , \\ 0 & \text{if } s = \text{half-odd-integer} . \end{cases} \quad (5.36)$$

This is the main result of this paper – an explicit expression for the tunnel splitting energy in a non-trivial setting.

Expression (??) can be evaluated numerically (see the last paragraph of appendix ?? for the definition of J_b and $f(\varphi)$, and eqs. (??), (??) and (??) for φ_{as}). The results for Δ , in units of J , for some values of s are tabulated in table ??. It should be remarked, though, that strictly speaking and for several reasons, our methods are only applicable in the limit of $s \gg 1$. Collecting the s -dependencies of φ_{as} , $f''(0)$ and J_b gives

$$\Delta \propto sJ \exp[5.6s^{1/6} - 5.6s^{1/2}] \quad \text{for } s \gg 1 . \quad (5.37)$$

s	1	2	3	4	5	6	10	20
Δ/J	2.3	0.83	0.32	0.13	0.06	0.02	0.001	5×10^{-6}

VI. DESTRUCTIVE INTERFERENCE

It is quite striking that the tunnel splitting energy and the tunneling amplitude (see eqs. (??) and (??)) are exactly zero if s is a half-odd-integer. This is a consequence of destructive interference of the (+)-instanton and (−)-instanton amplitudes in eq. (??). Actually, this result can be arrived at without the need for a detailed calculation (see also [?]). All that is needed is the fact that $Re[\mathcal{S}_o^+] = Re[\mathcal{S}_o^-]$ and $\mathcal{N}^+ = \mathcal{N}^-$, which is guaranteed by

symmetry (under some technical assumptions, explained in section ??), and knowledge of the phase of the classical action, eq. (??). In fact, a similar result holds for a much larger class of tunneling problems on the Kagomé lattice.

Consider the simultaneous tunneling of larger sets of spins on the Kagomé lattice. Take, for example, any closed “loop” of spins such that all the spins on the loop alternate between the type A and type B around the loop. It is proven in appendix ?? that all such loops contain $4n+2$ spins (with n some integer). Now consider a “generalized weathervane mode”, i.e. tunneling between configurations $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ that differ from each other only through $\phi_l \rightarrow \phi_l + \pi$ for each spin on the loop (i.e. in that all A- and B-spins on the loop are interchanged). This generalized weathervane mode does not cost any classical exchange energy, but selection effects provide a coplanarity barrier that has to be tunneled through. Under the (admittedly somewhat tenuous) assumption that during the tunneling motion of the $4n+2$ spins all other spins will remain fixed, the following assertions can be made: The absolute values of the tunneling amplitudes of the (+)-instanton and (−)-instanton events are equal, and the relative phase between them is $i2\pi s(4n+2)(-\frac{3}{2})$. Hence, for half-odd-integer s , destructive interference between (+)-instantons and (−)-instantons occurs again.

Only when two loops, with a total number of $4n$ spins, tunnel simultaneously and synchronously will there be constructive interference between all the $4n$ spins. The smallest group of spins for which this is conceivable is the 6-spin inner loop of a hexagon, nested inside a larger loop of 18 spins. These two loops would tend to tunnel synchronously, because of the coplanarity forces between the triangles connecting them. Thus, the smallest tunneling event that has a non-zero amplitude involves a double loop of altogether 24 spins.

The fact that destructive interference happens for half-odd-integer s is noteworthy, since s is half-odd-integer for the two experimental realizations of the Kagomé lattice that have been proposed. These are the magnetoplumbite $SrCr_{8-x}Ga_{4+x}O_{19}$ ($s = \frac{3}{2}$) [?, ?, ?] and the second layer of He^3 atoms on a graphite substrate ($s = \frac{1}{2}$) [?, ?].

VII. CONCLUSION

A. Discussion: Comparison of energy scales

In this paper, the tunneling barrier was taken as a fixed potential, given by $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}}$ in eq. (??), although the original Hamiltonian (??) had *no* “coplanarity forces”. In what follows, we argue that this approach can be justified in the limit of large s .

Our estimate of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}}$ in appendix ?? is based on the following strategy: The tunneling hexagon is frozen at a given point along its tunneling path, at which its plane is tilted by φ relative to the reference plane. Then the frequencies $\omega_l(\varphi)$ of the zero-point modes of the spins on neighboring hexagons are calculated as a function of φ . The coplanarity barrier is then proportional to $\sum_l \frac{1}{2}\hbar(\omega_l(\varphi) - \omega_l(0))$.

This procedure is reasonable if the tunneling process is “adiabatically” slow, i.e. if the duration of an instanton, say τ_{in} , is indeed long compared to the typical oscillation periods $\omega_l^{-1}(\varphi)$ of the zero-point modes on the surrounding hexagons. In this case, we are effectively “integrating out” in a crude way the fast modes of a complicated many-spin problem. However, if for some zero-point modes one has $\omega_l^{-1}(\varphi) \gtrsim \tau_{\text{in}}$, these modes are

slower than the instanton and do not have time to affect the barrier. In that case, the effective barrier should be smaller than the one we used, since the contributions of slow modes to $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}}$ should not be counted.

Now, in appendix ??, the behavior of the zero-point modes of the hexagons surrounding the tunneling hexagon is found to be as follows: There are both ordinary and soft modes (corresponding to $\rho_{l \neq 3}^\alpha$ and $\rho_{l=3}^\alpha$, respectively, in appendix ??). For the ordinary modes, we find $\hbar\omega_l(\varphi) \sim sJ$, as is usual for antiferromagnets. The soft modes are weathervane-like fluctuations; as $\varphi \simeq 0$, we find $\hbar\omega_{\text{soft}}(\varphi) \sim s^{\frac{2}{3}}J$, while for large φ , one has $\hbar\omega_{\text{soft}}(\varphi) \sim sJ$. If one were to consider fluctuations on the entire lattice (instead of only on the neighboring hexagons of the tunneling hexagon), these soft modes would translate to an entire brach of soft modes, for which one would also expect $\hbar\omega_{\text{soft}} \sim s^{\frac{2}{3}}J$. This, indeed, is the result found by Chubukov [?], using a method based in Fourier space.

The duration of an instanton event, on the other hand, scales with s according to $\tau_{\text{in}} \sim 1/d \sim \hbar/(Js^{\frac{1}{2}})$, according to eqs. (??) and (??). Thus, in the limit of $s \gg 1$, one has $\tau_{\text{in}} \gg \omega_l^{-1}$ for all zero-point modes, both ordinary and soft. In this limit, the instanton is thus indeed slow compared to the zero-point fluctuations, justifying the use of a coplanarity barrier $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}}$ for sufficiently large s .

How does the calculated tunnel splitting energy Δ compare to the in-plane selection energy (of order J_c) mentioned in section ??, that tends to lift the degeneracy between $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$, and hence to suppress tunneling? According to Chubukov [?] (see also [?]), J_c is a small fraction of the zero-point soft-mode energy, i.e. $J_c \sim \eta Js^{2/3}$, with $\eta < 0.05$. Since we found $J_b = 5/2Js$ (see eq. (??)), neglecting J_c relative to J_b is justifiable, particularly when $s \gg 1$. This is the justification for not adding an in-plane selection term to $\mathcal{H}_{\text{hex}}$ in eq. (??) in the same way that we added the coplanarity selection term $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}}$. However, it should be noted that for small tunneling angles φ , for which $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cop}} \sim Js^{2/3}$, the inclusion of in-plane selection effects, also of order $Js^{2/3}$, would probably affect some of our results. For example, our calculation of φ_{as} in section ?? would be affected if $Js\varphi^* \ll J_c \ll J_b$.

Finally, from the table on p.??, it follows that for physically realizable (i.e. small) spin values, we have $\Delta \gtrsim J_c$. Thus, to the extent that our calculations can be trusted for small s , tunneling effects are at least as important as in-plane selection in determining the true nature of the ground state. We conclude, therefore, that for small (integer) s , tunneling should be regarded as a significant disordering mechanism competing with order-from-disorder selection effects.

In a quantum Potts model of the entire Kagome system, the Hamiltonian would have matrix elements proportional to Δ between any two pairs of states which differed by the exchange $A \leftrightarrow B$ along a single 6-spin hexagon loop (or more generally, there would be matrix elements for any larger closed loop of alternating AB-spins). Then a superposition of Potts states, which takes advantage of the resonance between different hexagons (or larger loops), would have a lower energy (at small s) than the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ state which is favored by the J_c term.

Two possible kinds of ground states suggest themselves: The first is a “totally disordered” Potts state; it can be idealized by a trial wavefunction which is an equal superposition of all the Potts groundstates, which is known to be disordered (it has only algebraically decaying correlations [?]). The second kind of ground state is a “partially disordered” $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ state; an idealized trial wavefunction has, say, all C-spins fixed, as in the usual $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ state,

but each ABABAB-hexagon is replaced by an equal superposition of the ABABAB- and BABABA-configurations, (with no correlation between one hexagon and another.) Such a state would still have long-range order with respect to the C-spins, but would be disordered with respect to the A- and B-spins. We call this a “ferrimagnetic” ground state, since the expectation value of $\mathbf{n}_z$ is +1 on the C-sublattice, and $-\frac{1}{2}$ on the other two sublattices.

Both these candidate states have considerably less order than the long-range-ordered $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ state. On the other hand, they are more ordered than the “spin-nematic” state which has been previously proposed for this system [?,?]. In the “spin nematic”, all spins lie in the same plane, but all directions in a given plane are equally likely, i.e. $\langle e^{i\theta(\mathbf{r})} \rangle = 0$. The states described by quantum Potts models, have either an A-, B- or C-spin at each site, so that $\langle e^{i3\theta(\mathbf{r})} \rangle \neq 0$ [?].

For half-odd-integer s , of course, hexagon tunneling is absent (the smallest tunneling event with non-zero amplitude involves the synchronous turning of 24 spins), as discussed in section ???. Therefore, one would expect the long range order of the usual $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ state to persist, at least to much smaller values of s than for integer spins.

B. Possible extension and other applications

A more fundamental approach for treating coplanarity selection effects, that should be trustworthy also for small s , would be as follows: write down a functional integral for the entire N -spin system, starting from the Heisenberg Hamiltonian, eq. (??), without an explicit coplanarity term such as eq. (??). Adopt a tunneling path in which only the six spins of the tunneling hexagon move. The tunneling coordinates would be essentially the same as the collective coordinates (Φ_o, Z_o) introduced in section ??. However, one would then have of order $N - 1$ transverse modes, instead of only 5. Integrating these out would result in an effective potential for (Φ_o, Z_o) , which could, in principle, be non-local in time (since it encodes the effect of changing (Φ_o, Z_o) at time τ on the transverse modes, which, if these modes are slow, will in turn influence the potential felt by (Φ_o, Z_o) at later times).

We briefly mention a possible application of tunneling calculations in the context of finite-size systems. Consider some frustrated antiferromagnetic system whose ground states have spin order with non-trivial discrete symmetry. For small system sizes, the eigenvalue spectrum can be found by exact diagonalization of the Hamiltonian. Tunneling calculations could be useful in obtaining better interpretations of such an eigenvalue spectrum. For example, the $J_1 - J_2$ square antiferromagnet (for $J_2 > 0.5J_1$) has classical ground states in which the even sublattice has alternating spins of one staggered magnetization and the odd sublattice has an independent, arbitrary staggered magnetization. When quantum fluctuations are taken into account, spin-wave theory gives an effective “collinearity” force (analogous to the coplanarity term in eq. (??) in the present paper). This lines up the staggered magnetizations along the same axis, in either sense [?,?], so that classically there are two ground states related by a discrete symmetry and separated by a barrier. Consequently, the two lowest eigenstates of a large system should both be spin singlets, namely the symmetric and antisymmetric combinations of the two classical ground states (which are also spin singlets) that have been mixed by quantum tunneling. (This behavior contrasts to that of ordinary antiferromagnets; there the smallest gap is associated with $E \simeq \frac{s(s+1)}{2\chi}$, where χ is the susceptibility, so that the first excited state is a triplet.) The classical path expected (in a small